UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/582,794	10/31/2006	Jens Christian Norrild	141-451	7176
	7590 03/12/200 NDERHYE, PC	EXAMINER		
	LEBE ROAD, 11TH F	HANLEY, SUSAN MARIE		
ARLINGTON, VA 22203			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			1651	
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			03/12/2009	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	10/582,794	NORRILD ET AL.
Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit
	SUSAN HANLEY	1651
The MAILING DATE of this communication app Period for Reply	pears on the cover sheet with the c	orrespondence address
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING D.  - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.1 after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.  - If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	ATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION 36(a). In no event, however, may a reply be tin will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from a, cause the application to become ABANDONE	N. nely filed the mailing date of this communication. D (35 U.S.C. § 133).
Status		
1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 14 July 2a) This action is <b>FINAL</b> . 2b) This 3) Since this application is in condition for alloware closed in accordance with the practice under Expression in the condition of the con	action is non-final.  nce except for formal matters, pro	
Disposition of Claims		
4)  Claim(s) 33-64 is/are pending in the applicatio 4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdra 5)  Claim(s) is/are allowed. 6)  Claim(s) is/are rejected. 7)  Claim(s) is/are objected to. 8)  Claim(s) 33-64 are subject to restriction and/or	wn from consideration.	
<u> </u>		
9) The specification is objected to by the Examine 10) The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a) accomposed applicant may not request that any objection to the Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correct 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examine	epted or b) objected to by the I drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See tion is required if the drawing(s) is obj	e 37 CFR 1.85(a). jected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119		
<ul> <li>12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign a) All b) Some * c) None of:</li> <li>1. Certified copies of the priority document</li> <li>2. Certified copies of the priority document</li> <li>3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority application from the International Burea</li> <li>* See the attached detailed Office action for a list</li> </ul>	s have been received. s have been received in Applicati rity documents have been receive u (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).	on No ed in this National Stage
Attachment(s)  1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)  2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)  3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date 10/18/06; 6/14/06.	4) Interview Summary Paper No(s)/Mail Da 5) Notice of Informal F 6) Other:	ate

## **DETAILED ACTION**

## Election/Restrictions

Restriction is required under 35 U.S.C. 121 and 372.

This application contains the following inventions or groups of inventions which are not so linked as to form a single general inventive concept under PCT Rule 13.1.

In accordance with 37 CFR 1.499, applicant is required, in reply to this action, to elect a single invention to which the claims must be restricted.

Group I, claim(s) 33-60, drawn to a reagent or dye.

Group II, claim(s), 61-63 drawn to a method of detecting or measuring an analyte having the structure of claim 33.

Group III, claim(s) 64, drawn to a complex.

The inventions listed as Groups I-III do not relate to a single general inventive concept under PCT Rule 13.1 because, under PCT Rule 13.2, they lack the same or corresponding special technical features for the following reasons: A "special technical feature" is defined by PCT Rule 13.2 as "those technical features that define a contribution which each of the claimed inventions, considered as a whole, makes over the prior art." In the instant case, as discussed below, a number of the claimed inventions fail to make any contribution over the prior art. Because a number of the claimed inventions fail to make any contribution over the prior art, the claims as filed fail to contain a single common special technical feature supporting a showing unity of invention.

Specifically, Mills (WO 8909833) teaches numerous trityl compounds having at least two electron donating groups (especially alkyl-substituted amino groups; see Table II), thus demonstrating that a number of the multitude of embodiments for the claimed reagent/dye recited in the claims lack novelty. Because those claimed embodiments fail to make a contribution over the prior art, it is clear that all claims as filed fail to provide a special technical feature common to all claimed inventions. Because the claims as filed lack a common special technical feature, the claims lack unity.

Lack of a common special technical feature, and therefore lack of unity, is further demonstrated by the fact that the various products claimed, compounds having a multitude of possible substituents combinations, all have vastly different properties.

This application contains claims directed to more than one species of the generic invention. These species are deemed to lack unity of invention because they are not so linked as to form a single general inventive concept under PCT Rule 13.1.

The species are as follows:

R<sup>1</sup>, R<sup>2</sup>, R<sup>3</sup>, R<sup>4</sup>, R<sup>5</sup>, R<sup>6</sup>, R<sup>7</sup>, R<sup>8</sup>, R<sup>9</sup>, R<sup>10</sup>, R<sup>11</sup>, R<sup>12</sup>, R<sup>13</sup>, R<sup>1</sup>, R<sup>14</sup>, and R<sup>15</sup>. Applicant is required to make the specie elections with the caution that the elected specie must be a specific compound disclosed per se or that it may be subject to a New Matter rejection.

Applicant is required, in reply to this action, to elect a single species to which the claims shall be restricted if no generic claim is finally held to be allowable. The reply must also identify the claims readable on the elected species, including any claims subsequently added. An argument that a claim is allowable or that all claims are generic is considered non-responsive unless accompanied by an election.

Upon the allowance of a generic claim, applicant will be entitled to consideration of claims to additional species which are written in dependent form or otherwise include all the limitations of an allowed generic claim as provided by 37 CFR 1.141. If claims are added after the election, applicant must indicate which are readable upon the elected species. MPEP § 809.02(a).

The claims are deemed to correspond to the species listed above in the following manner: Claims 1-64.

The following claim(s) are generic: No claim is generic.

The species listed above do not relate to a single general inventive concept under PCT Rule 13.1 because, under PCT Rule 13.2, the species lack the same or corresponding special technical features for the following reasons: The inventions listed as Groups I-III do not relate to

a single general inventive concept under PCT Rule 13.1 because, under PCT Rule 13.2, they lack the same or corresponding special technical features for the following reasons: A "special technical feature" is defined by PCT Rule 13.2 as "those technical features that define a contribution which each of the claimed inventions, considered as a whole, makes over the prior art." In the instant case, as discussed below, a number of the claimed inventions fail to make any contribution over the prior art. Because a number of the claimed inventions fail to make any contribution over the prior art, the claims as filed fail to contain a single common special technical feature supporting a showing unity of invention.

Page 4

Specifically, Mills (WO 8909833) teaches numerous trityl compounds having at least two electron donating groups (especially amino groups; see Table II), thus demonstrating that a number of the multitude of embodiments for the claimed reagent/dye recited in the claims lack novelty. Because those claimed embodiments fail to make a contribution over the prior art, it is clear that all claims as filed fail to provide a special technical feature common to all claimed inventions. Because the claims as filed lack a common special technical feature, the claims lack unity.

Lack of a common special technical feature, and therefore lack of unity, is further demonstrated by the fact that the various products claimed, compounds having a multitude of possible substituents combinations, all have vastly different properties.

.

Applicant is advised that the reply to this requirement to be complete must include (i) an election of a species or invention to be examined even though the requirement may be traversed (37 CFR 1.143) and (ii) identification of the claims encompassing the elected invention.

The election of an invention or species may be made with or without traverse. To preserve a right to petition, the election must be made with traverse. If the reply does not distinctly and specifically point out supposed errors in the restriction requirement, the election shall be treated as an election without traverse.

Applicant is reminded that upon the cancellation of claims to a non-elected invention, the inventorship must be amended in compliance with 37 CFR 1.48(b) if one or more of the currently named inventors is no longer an inventor of at least one claim remaining in the application. Any amendment of inventorship must be accompanied by a request under 37 CFR 1.48(b) and by the fee required under 37 CFR 1.17(i).

The examiner has required restriction between product and process claims. Where applicant elects claims directed to the product, and the product claims are subsequently found allowable, withdrawn process claims that depend from or otherwise require all the limitations of the allowable product claim will be considered for rejoinder. <u>All</u> claims directed to a nonelected process invention must require all the limitations of an allowable product claim for that process invention to be rejoined.

In the event of rejoinder, the requirement for restriction between the product claims and the rejoined process claims will be withdrawn, and the rejoined process claims will be fully examined for patentability in accordance with 37 CFR 1.104. Thus, to be allowable, the rejoined claims must meet all criteria for patentability including the requirements of 35 U.S.C. 101, 102, 103 and 112. Until all claims to the elected product are found allowable, an otherwise proper restriction requirement between product claims and process claims may be maintained.

Withdrawn process claims that are not commensurate in scope with an allowable product claim will not be rejoined. See MPEP § 821.04(b). Additionally, in order to retain the right to rejoinder in accordance with the above policy, applicant is advised that the process claims should be amended during prosecution to require the limitations of the product claims. Failure to do so may result in a loss of the right to rejoinder. Further, note that the prohibition against double patenting rejections of 35 U.S.C. 121 does not apply where the restriction requirement is withdrawn by the examiner before the patent issues. See MPEP § 804.01.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to SUSAN HANLEY whose telephone number is (571)272-2508. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F 9:00-5:30.

Application/Control Number: 10/582,794 Page 6

Art Unit: 1651

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Michael Wityshyn can be reached on 571-272-0926. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/Susan Hanley/ Examiner, Art Unit 1651

> /Irene Marx/ Primary Examiner Art Unit 1651